

**PATENT APPLICATION
DOCKET NO. 10001605-1**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

INVENTOR(S): Garth F. Schmeling **CONFIRMATION NO:** 3838
SERIAL NO.: 09/784,116 **GROUP ART UNIT:** 2131
FILED: February 14, 2001 **EXAMINER:** Chai, Longbit
SUBJECT: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING CUSTOMIZED SECURE
ACCESS TO SHARED DOCUMENTS

APPELLANTS'/APPLICANTS' SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF ON APPEAL

1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 20555 S.H. 249 Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holding, LLC.

2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.

There are no other appeals or interferences known to Appellants, Appellants' legal representative or the Assignee which will affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

3. STATUS OF CLAIMS.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34, and 35 are pending and stand rejected. All pending claims are appealed.

4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.

No amendments have been filed after the final action was been entered. All previous amendments, if any, have been entered.

5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.

Claim 1 recites a method for sharing data that includes receiving, from a user of a client, a request for data from a server. *See, e.g.*, Specification, page 5, lines 20-26. Access rights for the user are obtained. *See, e.g.*, Specification, page 5, line 27- through page 6, line 2. The method also includes downloading to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet, the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights. *See, e.g.*, Specification, page 6, lines 8-11.

Claim 13 recites a document management system that includes a server and an agent. *See, e.g.*, Figure 1 and Specification, page 5, lines 20-26. The server is for providing data from a document stored in a folder and is operable to receive, from a user of a client, a request for the data. *See, e.g.*, Specification, page 3, line 26 through page 4, line 7. The agent is associated with the older and is operable to obtain access rights for the user and to cause the server to download to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet. *See, e.g.*, Specification, page 3, line 26 through page 4, line 7. The applet is operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights. *See, e.g.*, Specification, page 4, lines 8-19.

6. GROUNDS FOR REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED.

A. Claims 1-5, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 35 were rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,105,027 issued to Schneider in view of USPN 6,529,910 issued to Fleskes.

B. Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,105,027 issued to Schneider in view of USPN 6,529,910 issued to Fleskes and in further view of USPN 6,253,193 issued to Ginter.

C. Claims 15 and 30 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,105,027 issued to Schneider in view of USPN 6,529,910 issued to Fleskes and in further view of US Pub 2001/0042124 to Barron.

D. Claims 22, 27, 29, and 34 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,105,027 issued to Schneider in view of USPN 6,529,910 issued to Fleskes and in further view of USPN 6,937,726 issued to Wang.

E. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,105,027 issued to Schneider in view of USPN 6,529,910 issued to Fleskes and in further view of USPN 6,937,726 issued to Wang and in further view of US Pub 2001/0042124 to Barron.

7. ARGUMENT.

- A. Ground for Rejection A – Claims 1-5, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 35 were rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,105,027 issued to Schneider in view of USPN 6,529,910 issued to Fleskes.**

Claim 1 directed to a method for sharing data and recites the following acts:

1. receiving, from a user of a client, a request for data from a server;
2. obtaining access rights for the user; and

3. downloading to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet, the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights.

Schneider teaches downloading an applet (2411) and a list (2431) to a browser (2429). The applet uses the list (2431) to generate an intramap display (1801) shown in Figure 18. Schneider's list (2131) is generated in response to a request from the browser (2429). The list (2131) is created by filtering Ginter's intramap information (2422) to include only those resources to which a user of the browser (2429) has rights. The applet (2411) then uses the provided list (2431) to generate the intramap display (1801), shown in Figure 18. In short, Ginter's list (2431) is data downloaded to and displayed by Ginter's browser (2429).

The Examiner mistakenly equates Schneider's list (2431) with the access rights recites in Claim 1. Claim 1 plainly recites downloading **data and access rights** to a client. With respect to Claim 1, the data and the access rights are distinct items as is evidenced by the applet's ability to customize a display of the data according to the access rights. Schneider, on the other hand, only teaches downloading a list (2131) to a client. The Examiner cannot logically equate the list (2131) with both the data and the access rights recited by Claim 1. If that list (2131) could be equated with the recited access rights, then the list could not logically be equated with the recited data. If that list could be equated with the recited data then the list could not be logically equated with the recited access rights. At best Schneider's list (2131) is data downloaded to a browser for use in generating a display of that list. Any use of access rights are in the creation of Schneider's list (2131) and are not downloaded to the browser (2429).

The Examiner's confusion as to the access rights is evident in the Examiner's assertion that Schneider, column 2, lines 58-61 teaches the act of obtaining access rights for a user. The two paragraphs from which that passage is taken are reproduced below:

It is harder to restrict access. If information may be accessed at all via the Internet, it is potentially accessible to anyone with access to the Internet. Once there is Internet access to information, blocking skilled intruders becomes a difficult technical problem.

It is harder to maintain security en route through the Internet. The Internet is implemented as a packet switching network. It is impossible to predict what route a message will take through the network. It is further

impossible to ensure the security of all of the switches, or to ensure that the portions of the message, including those which specify its source or destination, have not been read or altered en route.

Schneider, col. 2, lines 55-67.

These paragraphs mention nothing of obtaining access rights for a user. The paragraphs simply discuss the difficulty of Internet security.

Consequently, Schneider fails to teach or suggest downloading to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet, the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights. Fleskes is silent on this point. For at least this reason, Claim 1 is patentable over those references as are Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12, 22, 23, and 27 which depend from Claim 1.

Claim 13 is directed to a document management system and recited the following elements:

1. a server for providing data from a document stored in a folder, the server operable to receive, from a user of a client, a request for the data;
2. an agent associated with said folder, the agent operable to obtain access rights for the user and to cause the server to download to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet, the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights.

Again, Schneider and Fleskes fail to teach an agent that is operable to cause a server to download to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet without regard to the applet's capabilities. For at least this reason, Claim 13 is patentable over those references as are Claims 15, 16, 18, 29, 30, 34, and 35 which depend from Claim 13.

B. Ground for Rejection B – Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,105,027 issued to Schneider in view of USPN 6,529,910 issued to Fleskes and in further view of USPN 6,253,193 issued to Ginter.

Claims 8-10 depend from Claim 1 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. For the same reasons Claim 11 is patentable, so are Claims 8-10.

- C. Ground for Rejection C – Claims 15 and 30 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,105,027 issued to Schneider in view of USPN 6,529,910 issued to Fleskes and in further view of US Pub 2001/0042124 to Barron.**

Claims 15 and 30 depend from Claim 13 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. For the same reasons Claim 13 is patentable, so are Claims 15 and 30.

- D. Ground for Rejection C – Claims 22, 27, 29, and 34 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,105,027 issued to Schneider in view of USPN 6,529,910 issued to Fleskes and in further view of USPN 6,937,726 issued to Wang.**

Claims 22, 27, 29, and 34 depend from Claim 13 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. For the same reasons Claim 13 is patentable, so are Claims 22, 27, 29, and 34.

- E. Ground for Rejection E – Claim 23 was rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,105,027 issued to Schneider in view of USPN 6,529,910 issued to Fleskes and in further view of USPN 6,937,726 issued to Wang and in further view of US Pub 2001/0042124 to Barron.**

Claim 23 depends from Claim 1 and includes all the limitations of that base Claim. For the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claims 23.

8. CONCLUSION

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34, and 35 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Garth F. Schmeling

By /Jack H. McKinney/
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

February 28, 2007

APPENDIX OF CLAIMS INVOLVED IN THE APPEAL

1. (previously presented) A method for sharing data including the steps of:
receiving, from a user of a client, a request for data from a server;
obtaining access rights for the user; and
downloading to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet, the applet
being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access
rights.
2. (previously presented) The invention of Claim 1 further comprising verifying
that the user has access rights for the data.
3. (previously presented) The invention of Claim 2 wherein the step of verifying
includes the step of authenticating a digital signature.
4. (previously presented) The invention of Claim 2 wherein the step of verifying
includes the step of authenticating a private key.
5. (previously presented) The invention of Claim 2 wherein the step of verifying
includes the step of authenticating a public key.
6. (cancelled)
7. (previously presented) The invention of Claim 1 further including the step of
allowing modification of the data according to the access rights.
8. (original) The invention of Claim 1 further including the step of tracking
changes in said document.
9. (original) The invention of Claim 1 further including the step of tracking access
of said document.

10. (original) The invention of Claim 1 further including the step of tracking submission of documents.

11. (cancelled).

12. (previously presented) The invention of Claim 1 further including the step of the applet causing the client to display a view of the data for the user, the view being customized according to the access rights.

13. (Previously presented) A document management system comprising:
a server for providing data from a document stored in a folder, the server operable to receive, from a user of a client, a request for the data;
an agent associated with said folder, the agent operable to obtain access rights for the user and to cause the server to download to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet, the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights.

14. (canceled)

15. (previously presented) The invention of Claim 13 wherein the agent is operable to encrypt the data and the access rights and the applet is operable to decrypt the data and the access rights.

16. (previously presented) The invention of Claim 13, further comprising means for allowing modification of the data according to the access rights.

17. (cancelled)

18. (previously presented) The invention of Claim 13 further including means for verifying a user's identity before the agent causes the server to download the data to the client.

19. (cancelled)

20. (Canceled)

21. (cancelled)

22. (previously presented) The method of Claim 1 wherein downloading includes downloading the accesses rights and the data with a session key, wherein the access rights and the data have been encrypted with the session key and the session key has been encrypted with a public key for the user.

23. (previously presented) The method of Claim 22 wherein the applet is operable to decrypt the session key with a private key for the user and to decrypt the data and the access rights with the decrypted session key.

24-26. (cancelled)

27. (previously presented) The method of Claim 22 further comprising randomly generating the session key.

28. (cancelled)

29. (previously presented) The invention of Claim 13, further comprising means for encrypting the data and the access rights with a session key and means for encrypting the session key with a public key for the user, and wherein the agent is operable to cause the server to download the encrypted session key to the client along with the applet, the encrypted access rights, and the encrypted data.

30. (currently amended) The invention of Claim ~~28~~ 29, wherein the applet is operable to decrypt the session key with a private key for the user and to decrypt the data and the access rights with the decrypted session key.

31-33 (cancelled)

34. (previously presented) The invention of Claim 29 further including means for randomly generating said session key.

35. (previously presented) The invention of Claim 13 wherein said access rights are stored in a database.

Evidence Appendix

There is no extrinsic evidence to be considered in this Appeal. Therefore, no evidence is presented in this Appendix.

Related Proceedings Appendix

There are no related proceedings to be considered in this Appeal. Therefore, no such proceedings are identified in this Appendix.